UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,171	12/27/2001	Peter A. Tenereillo	3239P100	1793

8791 7590 02/10/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER	
LAZARO, DAVID R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/034,171	TENEREILLO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Lazaro	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed 11/22/05.

2. Claims 1-20 are pending in this office action.

Response to Amendment

3. Applicants' arguments filed 11/22/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See Response to Arguments. Accordingly, the grounds of rejection, as presented in the office action mailed 08/25/05, are respectfully maintained and this action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-12 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,185,598 by Farber et al. (Farber) in view of U.S. Patent 6,742,044 by Aviani et al. (Aviani).

6. With respect to Claim 1, Farber teaches adapted for a network including a client and a plurality of local domains including at least a first local domain and a second local domain, a method comprising:

segmenting content including a Base Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) (Col. 16 lines 51-65) into multiple packets by a personal content director of the first local domain (Col. 3 lines 51-59 and Col. 1 lines 10-27, noting that content is segmented into packets when the network is the internet), a first packet of the multiple packets including the Base URI (Col. 16 lines 51-65 and Col. 4 lines 33-38 and lines 55-57, noting that HTTP header information includes the Base URL);

substituting the Base URI for a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) Base tag within the first packets by the personal content director of the first local domain (Col. 16 lines 51-65); and

transmitting the first packet with the HTML Base tag by the personal content director to the client (Col. 10 lines 60-63).

Farber teaches selection of a personal content director based on some measure of network distance and that other similar dynamic solutions could be used (Col. 11 lines 10-17). Farber teaches a copy of a resource may be sent from one peer cache to another (Col. 10 lines 39-59).

Farber does not explicitly disclose transmitting the first packet of the multiple packets by the personal content director of the first local domain to at least a personal content director for the second local domain and subsequently additionally transmitting the first packets from the second personal director. This is in part, due to Farber using a different solution to select the particular personal content director to serve the client. Keeping in mind that Farber suggest using other solutions, Aviani discloses another solution. Aviani teaches multiple personal content director (BOOM clients Col. 6 lines

40-65), wherein a particular personal content director is chosen based on the smallest propagation delay (ie. a "race" solution) to the client (Col. 5 lines 41-54). To implement the race solution, each personal content director is forwarded a copy of the request (Col. 7 lines 27-42). Each personal content director can then send a response to the client, including an identification of the personal content director (Col. 9 lines 25-30). The personal content director selected to serve the client will be the one whose response was first received by the client (Col. 9 lines 25-55). Aviani also teaches that each personal content director may act as data cache (Col. 6 lines 51-65) and that the host server may be a personal content director (Col. 10 lines 6-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Aviani such that the method further comprises transmitting the first packet of the multiple packets by the personal content director of the first local domain to at least a personal content director for the second local domain; substituting the Base URI for a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) Base tag within each of the first packets by the personal content directors of at least the first and second local domains; and transmitting the first packet with the HTML Base tag by the personal content directors to the client. One would be motivated to have this, as there is need for alternative solutions for providing fast and efficient routing and load balancing of web traffic across data networks (In Aviani:. Col. 2 lines 29-32 and Col. 5 lines 41-54).

7. With respect to Claim 2, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches retrieving content by the personal content director at the first local domain (In Farber: Col. 10 lines 38-63).

8. With respect to Claim 3, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 2 and further teaches wherein the Base URI being an Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) provided by an initial request by the client causing retrieval of the content by the personal content director at the first local domain (In Farber: Col. 10 lines 38-63).

9. With respect to Claim 4, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the multiple packets are Transmission Control Protocol (TCP) packets (In Farber: Col. 3 lines 51-59 and Col. 1 lines 10-27, noting the Internet uses TCP/IP) *and* (In Aviani: Col. 5 lines 41-63).

10. With respect to Claim 5, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein transmission of the first packet between the personal content director at the first local domain and at least the personal content director at the second local domain is made over an authenticated communication link (In Aviani: Col. 7 line 61 - Col. 8 line 23).

11. With respect to Claim 6, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the HTML Base tag substituted within the first packet transmitted by the person content director of the first local domain points to the first local domain (In Farber: Col. 16 lines 51-65).

12. With respect to Claim 7, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 6 and further teaches wherein the HTML Base tag substituted within the first

packet transmitted by the person content director of the second local domain points to the second local domain (In Farber: Col. 16 lines 51-65).

13. With respect to Claim 8, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the first packets with the HTML Base tags are simultaneously transmitted by the personal content directors (In Aviani: Col. 9 lines 25-40).

14. With respect to Claim 9, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches wherein the first packets with the HTML Base tags are transmitted by the personal content directors substantially concurrent to each other (In Aviani: Col. 9 lines 25-40).

15. With respect to Claim 10, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches incorporating an earlier first packet received by the client from the plurality of personal content directors into a data stream and disregarding the later received first packets (In Aviani: Col. 9 lines 25-55 and Col. 10 line 66 - Col 11 line 8).

16. With respect to Claim 11, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches accessing the local domain associated with the person content director that transmitted the first data packet earliest received by the client for subsequent data requests (In Aviani: Col. 9 lines 25-55 and Col. 10 lines 48-55).

17. With respect to Claim 12, Farber teaches, adapted for performing proximity measurements over a network including a client and a plurality of local domains (Col. 5 lines 35-39), a method comprising:

retrieving a file by logic within a first local domain of the plurality of local domains (Col. 10 lines 38-59), the file including a plurality of links for downloadable streaming media (Col. 5 line 41 - Col. 6 line 15);

transmitting a copy of the file from the first local domain to at least a second local domain of the plurality of local domains (Col. 10 lines 39-59);

translating at least one link of the plurality of links to point to a corresponding local domain (Col. 16 line 51 - Col. 17 line 12);

transmitting the file to the client (Col. 10 lines 60-63).

Farber teaches selection of a personal content director based on some measure of network distance and that other similar dynamic solutions could be used (Col. 11 lines 10-17). Farber teaches a copy of a resource may be sent from one peer cache to another (Col. 10 lines 39-59).

Farber does not explicitly disclose transmitting a copy of a file from the first local domain to at least a second local domain for the purpose of transmitting the file and at least the copy of the file to the client for determining one of the plurality of local domains being most proximate to the client. This is in part, due to Farber using a different solution to select the particular personal content director to serve the client. Keeping in mind that Farber suggest using other solutions, Aviani discloses another solution. Aviani teaches multiple personal content director (BOOM clients Col. 6 lines 40-65), wherein a particular personal content director is chosen based on the smallest propagation delay (ie. a "race" solution) to the client (Col. 5 lines 41-54). To implement the race solution, each personal content director is forwarded a copy of the request

(Col. 7 lines 27-42). Each personal content director can then send a response to the client, including an identification of the personal content director (Col. 9 lines 25-30). The personal content director selected to serve the client will be the one considered to be the most proximate to the client based on whose response was first received by the client (Col. 9 lines 25-55). Aviani also teaches that each personal content director may act as data cache (Col. 6 lines 51-65) and that the host server may be a personal content director (Col. 10 lines 6-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber and modify it as indicated by Aviani such that the method further comprises at each local domain, translating at least one link of the plurality of links to point to that corresponding local domain; transmitting the file and at least the copy of the file to the client for determining one of the plurality of local domains being most proximate to the client. One would be motivated to have this, as there is need for alternative solutions for providing fast and efficient routing and load balancing of web traffic across data networks (In Aviani: Col. 2 lines 29-32 and Col. 5 lines 41-54).

18. With respect to Claim 14, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches wherein the translation of the at least one link of the plurality of links is conducted in accordance with predetermined link translation rules (In Farber: Col. 16 line 51 - Col. 17 line 12).

19. With respect to Claim 15, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches wherein the transmission of the file between the plurality

of local domains is made over an established, authenticated communication link (In Aviani: Col. 7 line 61 - Col. 8 line 23).

20. With respect to Claim 16, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches wherein at least the file and the copy of the file are simultaneously transmitted from the plurality of local domains (In Aviani: Col. 9 lines 25-40).

21. With respect to Claim 17, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches incorporating an earliest one of the file and the copy of the file received by the client into a data stream and disregarding the later received one of the file and the copy of the file (In Aviani: Col. 9 lines 25-55 and Col. 10 line 66 - Col 11 line 8).

22. With respect to Claim 18, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 17 and further teaches accessing the local domain associated with the earliest received one of the file and the copy of the file for subsequent data downloads of the streaming media by the client (In Aviani: Col. 9 lines 25-55 and Col. 10 lines 48-55).

23. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber in view of Aviani and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,029,200 by Beckerman (Beckerman).

24. With respect to Claim 13, Farber in view of Aviani teaches all the limitations of Claim 12 and further teaches the files may be those which include resource identifiers (In Farber: Col. 16 lines 28-32).

Farber in view of Aviani does not explicitly disclose the file is configured in an ASX metafile format. However, Beckerman teaches an ASX file is a file which includes resource identifiers Col. 4 line 35 - Col. 5 line 52.

As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Farber in view of Aviani and modify it as indicated by Beckerman such that the file is configured in an ASX metafile format. One would be motivated to have this, as it is explicitly stated that the files may be those which include resource identifiers (In Farber: Col. 16 lines 28-32), which includes ASX files. Furthermore, there is desire to off-load request processing for such files (In Farber: Col. 2 lines 55-60).

25. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,553,376 by Lewis (Lewis), Beckerman and Aviani.

26. With respect to Claim 19, Lewis teaches retrieving a file by logic within a first local domain of a plurality of local domains, the file including a link for downloadable streaming media (Col. 2 lines 20-31, Col. 6 lines 26-35, and note Col. 5 line 60 - Col. 6 line 4 indicated an example in the form of an ASF file); creating a redirect packet for the link by translating the location field of the redirect packet to point to a local domain (Col.

6 lines 36-45); and transmitting the redirect packet to the client (Col. 6 lines 36-45). Lewis further teaches the selection of a local domain can be determined based on which one is closest (Col. 8 lines 41-53).

Lewis does not explicitly disclose the file including a plurality of links where groupings of unique links from the plurality of links are established, with each grouping including at least one link of the plurality of links. Beckerman teaches a file can contain a plurality of links, particularly a plurality of links like those described by Lewis (In Beckerman: Col. 4 line 35 - Col. 5 line 52, ASX file can contain a plurality of links to ASF files). Beckerman further establishes groupings of unique links from the plurality of links, each grouping including at least one link of the plurality of links (Col. 5 lines 28-40).

Lewis does not explicitly disclose transmitting a redirect packet to at least a second local domain such that redirect packets are transmitted from the local domains to the client for determining one of the plurality of local domains being most proximate to the client for downloading the streaming media associated with the first grouping. Aviani discloses a technique for determining a local domain that is most proximate to the client. Aviani teaches multiple local domains (BOOM clients Col. 6 lines 40-65), wherein a particular local domain is chosen based on the smallest propagation delay (ie. a "race" solution) to the client (Col. 5 lines 41-54). To implement the race solution, each local domain is forwarded a copy of the request (Col. 7 lines 27-42). Each local domain can then send a response to the client, including an identification of the personal content director (Col. 9 lines 25-30). The local domain selected to serve the

client will be the one considered to be the most proximate to the client based on whose response was first received by the client (Col. 9 lines 25-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Lewis and modify it as indicated by Beckerman and Aviani such that the method comprises (a) retrieving a file by logic within a first local domain of a plurality of local domains, the file including a plurality of links for downloadable streaming media; (b) establishing groupings of unique links from the plurality of links, each grouping including at least one link of the plurality of links; (c) creating a redirect packet for a first grouping; (d) transmitting the redirect packet for the first grouping to at least a second local domain of the plurality of local domains; (e) at each local domain, translating a location filed of the redirect packet to point to that local domain; (f) transmitting the redirect packets from the local domains to the client for determining one of the plurality of local domains being most proximate to the client for downloading the streaming media associated with the first groupings. One would be motivated to incorporate the teachings of Beckerman, as there is desire for avoiding difficulties of handling files related to streaming multimedia (In Lewis: Col. 2 lines 41-56), including those including unique groupings (In Beckerman: Col. 1 lines 50-65 and Col. 2 lines 49-57). One would be motivated to incorporate the teachings of Lewis, as there is need for alternative solutions for providing fast and efficient routing and load balancing of web traffic across data networks (In Aviani: Col. 2 lines 29-32 and Col. 5 lines 41-54).

27. With respect to Claim 20, Claim 20 is rejected based on the same logic presented in the rejection of Claim 19, recognizing the combination presented would operate for any remaining groups.

Response to Arguments

28. Applicants' arguments filed 11/22/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

29. Applicants argue on page 7 of the remarks - "*There is no motivation or suggestion for the repeater servers to perform race conditions as allegedly set forth in Aviani...Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide such evidence of suggestion.*"

a. Examiner's response - The rejection provides explicit motivation in two forms. First, it is noted that Farber is concerned with the problem of choosing the proper repeater and states that selection should be based in part on load and some measure of network distance. Particularly, Col. 11, lines 12-14 states, "An appropriate repeater is one which is not too heavily loaded and which is not too far from the client in terms of some measure of network distance." Farber continues with a brief statement on the disclosed method, but then explicitly suggests, "Other, dynamic solutions can also be used to select an appropriate repeater" (Col. 11 lines 16-17). The rejection makes note of this suggestion.

b. The combination of Farber and Aviani completes this suggestion, as Aviani is also concerned with the problem of choosing an appropriate server based in part on a measure of network distance (see abstract of Aviani).

Furthermore, as cited in the rejection, Aviani provides more motivation in terms of the need for solutions to this problem. Particularly, the need for alternative solutions for providing fast and efficient routing and load balancing of web traffic across data networks (In Aviani: Col. 2 lines 29-32 and Col. 5 lines 41-54).

c. Based on the rejection presented in the 08/25/05 office action and as maintained in this office action, it is clear that motivation has be provided to establish a proper prima facie case of obviousness. Applicants' arguments are not persusasive

30. Applicants argue on page 8 of the remarks - "*With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants repsectuflly submit that neither Farber nor Aviani, alone or in combination, suggest the operation of substituting the Base URI for a HTML Base tag within each of the first packets by the personal content directors of at least the first and second local domains...The BASE directive differs from the HTML Base tag that is used to point to the local domain of a personal content director (PCD).*"

d. Examiner's response - The BASE directive results in the substitution of the HTML BASE tag. Col. 16, lines 57-61, "The BASE address added specifies the resource at the reflector which originally served the resource. This means that unprocessed relative URLS...will be interpreted as relative to the reflector" (emphasis added). As the examiner interprets the reflector to be a personal content director that is in its local domain, it is clear that the BASE directive is used to point to the local domain of the personal content director. This done such that "when a browser requests repeatable resources identified by the requested resource, it gets them from a repeater without going back to the origin

server" (Col. 16 lines 33-35, emphasis added). Applicants' arguments are not persuasive.

31. Applicants argue on page 8 of the remarks - "*With respect to Claim 12, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Farber nor Aviani, alone or in combination, suggest the translating at least one link of the plurality of links to point to the corresponding local domain, and thereafter, transmitting the file and at least the copy of the file to the client for determining one of the plurality of local domains being most proximate to the client....In contrast, the translation in Farber is solely directed to ensuring that the reflector accesses local resources, and such translation is not used for proximity measurements.*"

e. Examiner's response - The claim language states, "translating at least one link of the plurality of links to point to that corresponding local domain". Farber explicitly discloses translation of links such that they point back to the corresponding reflector that is doing the translation of the links (Col. 16 lines 51 - Col. 17 line 12). The examiner considers this to be within the scope of "translating at least one link of the plurality of links to point to that corresponding local domain". It also noted that Farber is related to the issue of determining a local domain that is most proximate to the client (Col. 11 lines 10-17).

f. Furthermore, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

32. Applicants argue on page 8 of the remarks in relation to Claims 19 and 20 - "*Applicants respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established because neither Lewis, Beckerman nor Aviani, alone or in combination, suggest that, at each local domain, translating a location field of the redirect packet to point to that local domain...Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.*"

g. Examiner's response - Applicants' arguments are essentially conclusive statements that provide no reasoning or evidence in support thereof. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Applicants' arguments are not persuasive.

Conclusion

33. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

34. U.S. Patent 6,052,730 by Felciano et al. Discloses rewriting of URLs within HTML documents.

35. U.S. Patent 6,304,913 by Rune. Discloses selection of the closes server from a plurality of servers, based on hop count for example.

36. U.S. Patent 6,446,121 by Shah et al. Discloses the comparison of round trip time to determine the best mirrored service.

37. U.S. Patent 6,606,643 by Emens et al. Discloses selection of a mirror server based on the best response time as well as load values.

38. U.S. Patent 6,718,390 by Still et al. Discloses redirecting a client by translating references of a first server to point to a second server.

39. U.S. Patent 6,724,733 by Schuba et al. Discloses generation of distance metrics to determine a server with the shortest approximate distance.

40. U.S. Patent 6,810,411 by Coughlin et al. Discloses a race method to determine the most suitable host or server for the client.

41. U.S. Patent 6,920,498 by Gourlay et al. Disclose a race condition method to establish which content serving site has the least delay.

42. U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0038360 by Andrews et al. Discloses redirection based on network distance and load information.

43. U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0112036 by Bohannon et al. Discloses the use of Internet site selectors for directing a client to the most optimal, most available web site/content.

44. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 571-272-3986. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Lazaro
February 1, 2006

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER